

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/686,180	CAWTHORNE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Robert Grant	2838	

All Participants:

(1) Robert Grant.

(2) Mr. Leslie Hodges.

Status of Application: _____

(3) Mr. Vincent Cichosz.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 6 April 2005

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

none

Claims discussed:

Claim 1 and Claim 20

Prior art documents discussed:

none

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: There appeared to be a typographical error in Claims 1 and 20, as well as in the abstract and the summary of the invention. I spoke with Mr. Hodges and Mr. Cichosz in order to find out whether or not this was a typographical error, or if in fact the invention was intended to operate in this manner. It turned out to be a typographical error, and we agreed an examiners amendment would be the best approach for correcting the mistake. .